

REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of the claims of the present application are respectfully requested.

In the present Official Action, the Abstract was objected to because of the presence of blank spaces and hyperlinks. Applicants have amended the Abstract herein to correct the informalities.

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, applicant's cancel Claim 45 without prejudice.

Claims 2-15, 17, 19-25, 36-45 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Marsh et al. (US Patent Pub. No. 2004/0125129) (hereinafter "Marsh") in view of a reference to Rosenberg et al. entitled "A Framework for Conferencing with the Session Initiation Protocol" ("Rosenberg") and further in view of Watson (US Patent No. 6,233,605) and Engstrom (US Patent No. 7,433,922). It is noted that Watson and Engstrom are only being cited for the first time; consequently, applicants respect consideration and entry of the this Rule §1.116 amendment as it could not have been earlier presented and applicants have had no prior opportunity to substantively address the issues engendered by Watson and Engstrom.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 4 the Examiner admits that Marsh-Rosenburg do not disclose the generation of a graphic representation of the present state of the presentation, including a depiction of a current phase and all active users attending the presentation; providing an overview in the graphical representation, e.g., as a linear progression of each the plurality of phases in accordance with the pre-specified order, and, the monitoring of

the presentation phase the user is reviewing including prior, current and future phases of the agenda.

To make-up the deficiency, the Examiner cites newly-cited Watson (e.g., Fig. 6, abstract, etc) as allegedly teaching providing a graphic representation of the present state of the presentation, including a depiction of a current phase and all active users attending the presentation; including an overview in the graphical representation and a monitoring phase a user is reviewing including prior, current and future phases of the agenda.

However, admittedly, the office action indicates that Marsh-Rosenberg-Watson does not teach the limitation directed to graphically depicting within the representation all of the active users and including an indication of the activity level of teach of the active users, the level of activity including representing a given active user's focus of attention by indicating which presentation section each user is currently viewing.

To make-up the deficiency, the Examiner cites newly-cited Engstrom (e.g., col. 1 and 2) as displaying or indicating a user's presence including user's location within a presentation such as a streamed or broadcast content session.

Applicants respectfully disagree and address the addition of newly cited Watson and Engstrom references by amending each of Claims 4, 25 and 38 to set forth a further novel feature- directed to:

“providing, in said graphical representation, an overview of said presentation agenda as a linear progression of each said plurality of phases in accordance with said pre-specified order, a current phase graphically represented as a circle having a center” and, further,

“graphically depicting within said representation all said active users and an indication of an activity level of each said active users, said activity level of each said active user

participating in a current phase indicated based on a position of said graphically depicted active user relative to said center of said circle, said level of activity including representing a given active user's focus of attention by indicating which presentation section each user is currently viewing, including prior, current and future phases of said agenda...". That is, the current new recitations directed to an indication of an activity level of each said active users, said activity level of each said active user participating in a current phase indicated based on a position of said graphically depicted active user relative to said center of said circle is neither taught nor suggested by Marsh-Rosenberg-Watson-Engstrom references.

Support for this amendment is provided in paragraph ¶[[0037] of the present specification in support of Fig. 5 as it describes three (3) users graphically represented as icons (small circles) 7170, 7180, and 7190 attending a current phase of the presentation 7100 wherein the proximity of the graphically depicted user is shown relative to the position of the current speaker depicted at the center of the large circle (i.e., a current phase). A User represented as graphic 7180 is in the center of phase 2 circle, depicting his/her role as a current speaker. User represented as graphic 7190 is depicted near the outer edge of the circle, indicating that he/she is in a dormant or listening state. A user represented as graphic 7170, for example, is near the inner edge of the circle, indicating that he/she is active or recently active. A user represented as graphic 7160 is depicted not within the "current" phase circle 7100 but within a first phase of the presentation 7090 and thus, based on that graphic representation, indicates that he/she is reviewing material presented in an earlier phase.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations added are neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art of record. While the prior art appears to teach the graphic

representations of users (e.g. Watson) or at least, an indication of names of users (e.g., Marsh) participating in a presentation, none of them, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches the graphic depiction of current phase as a circle having a center; nor teaches the representation of the activity level of each active user participating in a current phase as indicated based on a position of the graphically depicted active user relative to the center of the circle. It is submitted that while Marsh appears to provide a GUI which provides a graphic representation of each step of a given meeting (Marsh et al. Figs 2 and 8), Marsh does not provide a representation of an overview of the presentation agenda as a linear progression of each said plurality of phases (as in applicants' Fig 5) and additionally, that includes a representation of the activity level of each active user participating in a current phase is indicated based on a position of the graphically depicted active user relative to the center of the circle depicted showing a current speaker. That is, no such overview is provided by either March nor Rosenberg, nor Watson nor Engstrom. Further, neither Marsh, nor Rosenberg, nor Watson nor Engstrom provide indication of the level of activity of the participants in each of the phases in the manner as now claimed in the present invention (e.g., Fig 5, graphic elements 7170 - 7190). Moreover, there appears no teaching or suggestion in either of these references that would lead one skilled in the art to procure such graphic representation of the presentation overview including an indication of an activity level of each said active users, the level of activity including representing a given active user's focus of attention by indicating which presentation section each user is currently viewing, including prior, current and future phases of said agenda.

Consequently, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of amended independent Claims 4, 25 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over the Marsh, whether taken alone or in combination with Rosenberg, Watson or

Engstrom and to allow remaining claims directly or indirectly dependent thereof to proceed to issuance.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, it is respectfully requested that he call the applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven Fischman", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SF:gc